KARAGANIS, WHITE & MAGEL LTD.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

414 NORTH ORLEANS STREET - SUITE 810

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610

TELEPHONE

(312) 836-1177

TELEFAX

(312) 836-9083

JOSEPH V. KARAGANIS
A. BRUCE WHITE
BARBARA ANNE MAGEL
MARK D. ERZEN
JOHN W. KALICH
CHRISTOPHER W. NEWCOMB

September 19, 2007

BY EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Mazin Enwiya
Work Assignment Manager / Project Manager
United States Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604

RE: Ellsworth Industrial Park Data Release: Preliminary Comments

Dear Mr. Enwiya:

In response to your email to Bruce White dated September 13th, please accept these comments on the "Ellsworth Industrial Park Site – Remedial Investigation Data Deliverable" (the "RI Data") on behalf of our client, Precision Brand Products, Inc.

These comments are preliminary. The time since our receipt of the RI Data has not been sufficient to allow us to review – let alone comment upon – everything that is contained in the RI Data. The CD containing the initial "Data Deliverable" is dated 24 August, 2007. We received that CD on August 30, 2007, and it was then supplemented via email on September 5, 2007 (attaching a non-password protected Access database). We are therefore offering these initial comments as we continue to look at the data. We will supplement these comments as soon as possible.

The CD and email with the data were provided to the other signatories to the Settlement Agreement and Order (SAO) promptly after you sent them to us. We anticipate that you will also be receiving comments on the USEPA/Weston RI Data from a number of those parties. It is our understanding and expectation that, consistent with the SAO and AIP, you will take all of these comments into consideration in finalizing the RI Data deliverable and developing the draft RI Report.

1. COMMENTS ON THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE RI DATA

We understand that the RI Data is intended, among other things, to allow the delineation of potential chlorinated solvent source areas within the Ellsworth Industrial Park, to delineate the pathways from the potential source areas to the bedrock aquifer system, and to delineate the distribution of contamination in the bedrock aquifer. (Ellsworth Industrial Park Site Quality Assurance Project Plan ("QAPP"), Rev. 0, pp. A-20 and A-21.)

The information contained in (or referred to by) the RI Data does not appear to be sufficiently comprehensive for the purposes set forth in the QAPP in three respects.

a. Relevant Data Collected During The RI Is Not Included In The RI Data

So far as we have been able to see in our examination of the RI Data, it appears that neither the survey data showing the elevations of the tops of the casings of the newly-drilled wells, nor the depth to groundwater measurements for the wells that were sampled, are included in the RI Data. (Both of these data collections are referred to on page 3 of Mr. Ruiz's cover letter to Mr. Enwiya dated 24 August, 2007.)

Although that data was produced in a preliminary form via emailed spreadsheets on June 25, 2007, the final version of this data should be included in the RI Data.[1]

b. Relevant Data Collected By Private Parties Is Not Included Or Referenced In The RI Data

On page 2 of Mr. Ruiz's cover letter to Mr. Enwiya dated 24 August, 2007, Mr. Ruiz refers to "a number of investigations conducted by private parties," including but not limited to six specific investigations. (The data collected during these six investigations is, so far as we can tell, not included in the RI Data.)

The list of "investigations conducted by private parties" should, at minimum, be expanded to include eight additional investigations[2] conducted by private parties. All eight of these investigations were provided to USEPA prior to or during the RI, and each investigation specifically targeted the contaminants that are the focus of the RI. The list of investigations by private parties should therefore include, in addition to the six currently listed, the following:

---

[1] That data should, if possible, also include any 2007 survey data measuring the elevations of wells that were constructed prior to the RI, so that we can see if the 2007 survey produced results that were comparable to the prior surveys (or, alternatively, if the 2007 survey was "tied in to" prior wells). No such data was contained in the spreadsheet that was distributed on June 25th. We also note that the "Groundwater Level Measurement.XLS" file distributed on June 25th lists depth to water as being measured "bgs." That creates a question as to whether the depth to groundwater was measured from the ground surface, or from the top of the well casing.

[2] In some instances the "investigation" only consisted of collecting and analyzing samples, without any formal report. For present purposes, that activity will be called an "investigation."

- Ames Property – Roux Associates (2006)
- Downers Grove Sanitary District Property – Weaver Boos and Huff & Huff (2006)[3]
- Fusibond Piping System Property – Weaver Boos and Roux Associates (2006)
- Lindy Property – ERM, Inc. (2002)
- Magnetrol International, Incorporated Property – Mostardi Platt Environmental and CPI (permeability study) (2006)
- Rexnord Industries Property – CRA (2006)
- Sterling North Park Property – Weaver Boos and Huff & Huff (2006)
- The Morey Corporation Former Property – CDM (2002 – 2005)

These investigations should be cited because, among other things, some of these investigations were undertaken in areas that USEPA had not examined (or had not thoroughly examined) prior to the RI, and the investigations showed the areas to have contamination concerns – concerns that were confirmed by the RI Data.

c. Relevant Groundwater Data Collected By Governmental Bodies Is Not Included Or Referenced In The RI Data

Finally, we also believe that the RI Data should refer to the bedrock groundwater data collected by other governmental agencies as part of their water supply sampling program. Specifically, quarterly bedrock groundwater sampling data from 1990 through 1995 exists for the two wells that formerly supplied the Belmont Highwood Water District and the well(s) that formerly supplied the Maple Hill Improvement Association. Those wells were located east and southeast of the Ellsworth Industrial Park.

In addition, periodic bedrock groundwater sampling data also exists for Downers Grove wells DG-6 (1985 through 1992 or 1993) (located due east of the Ellsworth Industrial Park) and DG-10 (1988 through 1993) (located in the Ellsworth Industrial Park). There is also a series of sampling data for surface water taken from St. Joseph Creek in 1987 and 1988 that should be mentioned.

All of this data is relevant to providing a fair and complete understanding of the bedrock groundwater near the Ellsworth Industrial Park, and actual and potential sources and patterns of contamination in the groundwater.

---

[3] Instances where samples were split with another consulting firm are counted as one investigation, even though two consulting firms were involved and there may be two sets of lab results and two reports. In those instances, both firms are listed with the lead firm listed first, e.g., Weaver Boos and Huff & Huff (2006).

2. COMMENTS AS TO THE GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF DATA COLLECTION

The RI Data provides sampling results for several areas where there was no apparent basis for investigation, such as Area J. Conversely, the RI Data does not provide any sampling results for the Eastern Area, notwithstanding significant known contamination (e.g., 47 to 62.7 ppb of TCE in intermediate groundwater per Huff & Huff, 4/25/2006.) (See PPR, Rev. 1, Figure 2-38).

We suggest that the RI Data indicate the Study Areas denoted in the PPR where data was ***not*** collected, as well as Study Areas where data ***was*** collected, so that the geographic scope of the RI Data, in comparison to the geographic scope of the Study Areas shown in the PPR, will be clear.

3. COMMENTS AS TO THE PRECISION OF LABORATORY DATA

The QAPP provides that from 10% to 30% of the soil samples were to be "sent to CRL for confirmation of the onsite mobile laboratory results" and/or "split and analyzed by CRL for confirmation." (QAPP, Rev 0, p. A-22 and A-23.)

Although the QAPP provides a formula for calculating a "relative percent difference" ("RPD") from duplicate analyses (QAPP, p. A-25), we were not able to locate any criteria in the QAPP that would determine what degree of agreement (or disagreement), or what RPD calculated from the results produced by the mobile lab and the CRL, constitutes "confirmation" (or non-confirmation).

We have, nonetheless, looked at a limited number of samples where the samples were analyzed by the mobile laboratory and by the CRL to see if there was agreement between the results reported by the mobile lab and the CRL. What we found, in our very limited review, indicated that the results reported by the mobile lab and the CRL often do not seem to be in agreement. The results of our limited review are summarized on Exhibit 1, and reflect some substantial disparities between mobile laboratory and CRL results for the same samples.[4] We have not had sufficient time to compare mobile lab results and CRL results on a comprehensive basis.

We also note that even soil samples that were split and analyzed in the same lab do not seem to have a close correlation between their results. See, e.g., the examples shown on Exhibit 2.

---

[4] The number of samples which report results from both the mobile lab and the CRL are limited. Of the samples that were analyzed by both the mobile lab and the CRL, many showed non-detectable levels for most or all analytes. Consequently, comparison between the results shown by the mobile lab and the CRL, and the calculation of a RPD, is only possible for the few samples that: (1) were analyzed in both the mobile lab and the CRL, and (2) produced reportable results for the same analyte from both labs.

Based on this limited inquiry, we suggest that before any effort is undertaken to draw conclusions based upon the RI Data, the degree of agreement or disagreement (or confirmation or non-confirmation) between the mobile lab results and the CRL results should be examined to determine if the data reported by the mobile lab and/or the CRL can properly serve as the basis for any conclusions.

4. COMMENTS AS TO THE PRECISION AND ACCURACY OF OTHER DATA

We also note, based on data collected by our consultants during the groundwater sampling event and our consultants' survey of the TOC elevations of the "PB" wells, that our consultants' numbers differ, possibly materially, from the numbers that were recorded in the spreadsheets showing well elevations and depths to groundwater. Those numbers, as noted above, have not yet been incorporated into the RI Data. When those numbers are incorporated into the RI Data, we will review them and comment if appropriate.

Please contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bruce White

Mark Erzen

MDE/ns
Enclosures
cc Mr. Thomas Krueger, Esq. / USEPA
Mr. Joseph Ruiz / Weston Solutions, Inc.
SAO Signatories

MDEPRK99.DOC

means a "J" value

SAMPLE ID	SS073-013-1	SS076-008-1	SS076-008-1	SS085-010-1	SS085-010-1	SS085-014-1	SS085-014-1	SS195-038-1	SS196-033-1	SS197-030-1	SS201-000-1	SS201-000-1	SS201-008-1	SS201-008-1	SS203-004-1	SS106-010-1
ANALYTE	Trichlor	Perc	Trichlor	Perc	Trichlor	Perc	Trichlor	Trichlor	Trichlor	Trichlor	Perc	Trichlor	Perc	Trichlor	Trichlor	TCA
RESULTS PER ...																
Mobile Lab	4,385.5	158.2	354.5	55.8	38.0	98.1	49.3	411.3	377.6	189.6	64.4	775.7	57.3	550.2	317.6	76.4
CRL	79.0	130.0	220.0	380.0	85.0	480.0	100.0	2,900.0	1,200.0	69.0	24.0	200.0	480.0	4,100.0	160.0	14.1
Off by a factor of ...	55.51	1.22	1.61	6.81	2.24	4.89	2.03	7.05	3.18	2.75	2.68	3.88	8.38	7.45	1.99	5.42
CRL was HIGH or low	low	low	low	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	low	low	low	HIGH	HIGH	low	low
Relative Percent Difference (smaller is better) (QAPP, p. A-25)	192.92	19.57	46.82	-148.78	-76.42	-132.12	-67.92	-150.32	-104.26	93.27	91.40	118.01	-157.34	-152.67	66.00	137.68

means a "J" value

SAMPLE ID	SS171-010-1	SS171-010-1	SS171-010-1	SS171-010-1	SS171-010-1	SS171-014-1	SS171-014-1	SS171-014-1	SS171-014-1	SS171-014-1	SS152-10-1	SS152-10-1	SS152-10-1	SS154-14-1	SS154-14-1	SS154-14-1
ANALYTE	TCA	1,1 DCA	1,1 DCE	Perc	Trichlor	TCA	1,1 DCA	1,1 DCE	Perc	Trichlor	TCA	1,1 DCA	1,1 DCE	1,1 DCA	1,1 DCE	cis 1,2 DCE
RESULTS PER ...																
Mobile Lab	221,170.9	1,902.5	2,267.2	8,391.9	1,508.1	100,185.0	1,610.2	1,232.9	1,496.4	1,737.4	122.0	88.9	71.0	249.6	68.2	32.3
CRL	770,000.0	1,300.0	10,000.0	11,000.0	1,900.0	1,500,000.0	6,900.0	8,900.0	33,000.0	5,000.0	2.0	3.7	5.7U	970.0	310.0	40.0
Off by a factor of ...	3.48	1.46	4.41	1.31	1.26	14.97	4.29	7.22	22.05	2.88	61.00	24.03		3.89	4.55	1.24
CRL was HIGH or low	HIGH	low	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	low	low		HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
Relative Percent Difference (smaller is better) (QAPP, p. A-25)	-110.74	37.63	-126.07	-26.90	-23.00	-174.96	-124.32	-151.33	-182.65	-96.85	193.55	184.02		-118.14	-127.87	-21.30

EXHIBIT 1

THESE ARE RESULTS FROM THE CRL					
ON SPLIT SAMPLES FOR THE SAME ANALYTES					
SS106-014-1	SS106-014-2	SS106-014-1	SS106-014-2	SS106-014-1	SS106-014-2
TCA	TCA	1,1 DCA	1,1 DCA	Trichlor	Trichlor
7.94U	119.0	85.3J	31.4	7.94U	91.6

	THESE ARE RESULTS FROM THE MOBILE LAB AND THE CRL			
	ON SPLIT SAMPLES FOR THE SAME ANALYTES			
	SS201-008-1	SS201-008-2	SS201-008-1	SS201-008-2
	Perc	Perc	Trichlor	Trichlor
Mobile Lab	57.3J	155.7	550.2	2,320.6
CRL	480.0J		4,100.0	

EXHIBIT 2

KARAGANIS, WHITE & MAGEL LTD.
414 NORTH ORLEANS STREET - SUITE 810
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610

SR-6J

Mazin Enwiya
Work Assignment Manager / Project Manager
United States Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604